



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

which "the noble German nature" is eulogized), and on the anti-papal movement in German Austria (written in a spirit of strong hostility to Catholicism). Finally, there is a paper on the relations of Morality and Religion, which has a more direct interest for the readers of this JOURNAL. In this essay Professor Pfeiderer first replies to criticisms directed against a morality based on religion, and then goes on to criticise the morality that is divorced from religion. He is more successful in the former than in the latter part of the essay. In his criticism of independent morality he seems to exaggerate its deficiencies, while not showing very convincingly that his religious morality is in a better position. For instance, he finds in independent morality a strong tendency towards egoism, and argues that "only because all individuals are conscious of their union with the super-subjective divine Will, which is at once the common ground of their being and the unconditional law of all action, do they feel that they are related to one another as parts of one organism, that they share in the same life, and are governed by the same law." But if individuals cannot become conscious of their moral relationship to each other in some more direct and ethical way, it may be questioned whether the consciousness of such a "transcendental union" would be more efficacious. At any rate the reasoning by which Professor Pfeiderer seeks to prove his contention is too vague and summary to be really convincing.

H. BARKER.

EDINBURGH UNIVERSITY.

GOOD CITIZENSHIP; A Collection of Essays. Edited by the Rev. J. E. Hands. London: George Allen, 1899.

"This book is intended as an appeal to Englishmen to take their citizenship more seriously." This review is an appeal to the authors to take the topics they deal with more seriously. To criticise in detail twenty-three essays of varying lengths and merits would take more space than can be offered here; to attack or praise a few of these essays and neglect the rest would be to pass over the main purpose of the book. There is one duty incumbent upon human beings who write essays on social, personal and economic problems and obligations, and that is to study the problems to the best of their ability and to write and think clearly and accurately upon them. It is by no means clear that many of the authors of

this book have done this. Few social and economic problems are at the present time more to the front than that of the Housing of the Poor; this topic has been treated by the editor. Statistical carelessness is one of his characteristics. He quotes death-rates without stating whether they are "crude" or "corrected." The value of the figures depends largely upon this; to expect the reader to obtain and study the Registrar General's returns in order to find out what the author means is unreasonable. We can only conclude that the author was careless whether or not his figures conveyed true or false impressions to the reader. The author urges that Mr. Booth's shelters should be treated like common lodging houses. They are common lodging houses. See *Logsdon vs. Booth* in 1900, 1 Q. B. (This case was subsequent to the date of the essay). The author then discusses our present system of rating on the basis of annual value, and then says that our *land system* enhances the value of sites. Land system is not an accurate phrase for rating system. But perhaps Mr. Hands means something different. If so, what? The general line of the argument is that the question is serious and that a certain alteration in the basis for rating might effect some amelioration, but only a slight one. What then is to be done? We are not told, but only that "the time is ripe for the Council to initiate a vigorous housing policy." But the whole difficulty is, what is the policy to be? If it is a bad one, the greater the vigor the more disastrous the result. To treat the subject like this is not a good example of taking citizenship seriously. Similar defects to these are to be found in many of the essays. A little rhetoric or a little insistence upon the fact that we are in name a Christian people is made to do duty for clear thought, hard work and luminous exposition. This condemnation is not true of all the essays. Mr. Dodds' on "The Poor Law" and Miss Wilson's on "Factories and Workshops" are more businesslike, and Archdeacon Wilson's on "The Progress of Morality in the Relation of Men and Women" is vigorous—too vigorous, perhaps, for it neglects many factors in the evils it discusses. The book as a whole leads to the conclusion that the "effort to show that a worthy citizenship must have its basis on a Christian and Ethical foundation" has not been successful.

C. P. SANGER.

LONDON.